

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1, 4, 8 and 24 have been amended to correct typographical errors.

Claims 1-23 are presently allowed.

Claims 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Brock et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,886,106).

Claim 24 calls for, among other elements, “sampling the input signal to obtain a plurality of edge values from the input signal responsive to an edge clock signal having a second duty-cycle...”

In rejecting claim 24, the Office Action at page 2 stated:

As shown in figures 1 and 2, Brock teaches an apparatus and method for adjusting the duty cycle of the sampling clock signal to the duty-cycle of the input signal based on the plurality of edge values. See also column 1, line 66 to column 2, line 21 and column 3, line 13 to column 5, line 60.

The Applicant’s attorney respectfully disagrees. The Examiner has not identified with any particularity the “sampling the input signal...” Fig. 1 illustrates two signals: an “INPUT CLOCK 14” and an “INTERGER 52.” INPUT CLOCK 14 is input to “CLOCK DIVIDER 16,” “SAMPLE CYCLE GENERATOR 30” and “GLITCHLESS CLOCK AND SAMPLE CYCLE MULTIPLEXER 100” while INTERGER 52 is input to SAMPLE CYCLE GENERATOR 30, “COMPARATOR 40,” and CLOCK DIVIDER 16. The Office Action has not identified which signal in *Brock et al.* corresponds to the claimed “input signal” and which circuit component in Fig. 1 does the “sampling...” Further, the Office Action has not identified “a plurality of edge values” and how the “plurality of edge values” [are obtained] “in response to an edge clock signal having a second duty-cycle...”

Further, claim 25 calls for “sampling the input signal to obtain a plurality of data values from the input signal responsive to a data clock signal.” The Office Action has not identified with particularity the claimed “a plurality of data values” and “a data clock signal.”

Claim 27 calls for “a sampler capable to obtain a plurality of edge values from the input signal responsive to an edge clock signal having a duty-cycle...” For at least the reasons stated above in regard to claim 24, claim 27 is likewise patentable.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of claims 1-27 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 16, 2007

By: /Kirk J. DeNiro/
Kirk J. DeNiro
Reg. No. 35,854

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665